

Testimony to the Higher Education and Employment Advancement Committee  
Re: S.B. No. 42  
Dr. Stephen Adair  
Professor, Department of Sociology & Elected Member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to  
the Board of Regents for Higher Education  
Central Connecticut State University  
[adairs@ccsu.edu](mailto:adairs@ccsu.edu)

Senator Bye, Representative Willis, and Members of the Higher Education and Employment Advancement Committee:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify about S.B. 42, *AN ACT CONCERNING THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION*.

My name is Stephen Adair. I am a Professor of Sociology and Chair of the Sociology Department at Central Connecticut State University (CCSU). I was elected by the faculty at CCSU to serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) to the Board of Regents and have been nominated for chair of the FAC.

I have two suggestions regarding S.B. 42.

1. I support revising the original language that established the FAC to make the selection process uniform across the three systems.

This year each university in CSU elected one representative to the FAC through a faculty-wide vote organized through the Faculty Senates. One of the four representatives was identified by a random process to serve as an alternate, which will rotate each year. This year the representative at Western is the alternate. I will be the alternate next year.

In contrast, the Community Colleges ran an election process for their three representatives through each faculty bargaining unit and elected one representative and two alternates for each of the three seats.

While the FAC is constituted according to the legislation with three voting members each from CSU and the Community-Technical Colleges and one from Charter Oak State College, at the first meeting there was an imbalance of representation at the table as the Community Colleges had six alternates and CSU had one.

Having four elected members with a rotating alternate works well for CSU. I recognize that such a configuration will be more challenging for the Community Colleges. I have heard suggestions that CSU increase the number of alternates, or even that there be a committee of 25: one elected from each of the community colleges, three from each CSU university, and one from Charter Oak. While I support the current size of the committee, the more important issue is that the selection process be uniform.

2. In our first and only meeting last month, the FAC agreed to operate with co-Chairs: one from CSU and one from the Community Colleges. The legislation requires us to name a Chair and a Vice-Chair, which we intend to identify at our next meeting on March 2, but recommend that the S.B. 42 be changed to identify co-Chairs, rather than rotating between Chair and Vice-Chair.

Thank you for your consideration and for allowing me this opportunity to testify on S.B. 42.

Sincerely,

Stephen Adair  
Professor, Sociology  
Central Connecticut State University  
Member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education